allowed to have their say. My hon. friend Shri Anis is to speak who would make a very valuable contribution. There are many other hon. Members also to speak on this. Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev is also to speak provided they want his support! Therefore, the best thing is that we should carry on with the UP discussion tomorrow ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Let one hon. Member each from the Congress Party and the BJP participate in the discussion and then the hon. Home Minister can reply so that we finish it today...*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : In the list, we have only one more speaker from the JD.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : Only the Home Minister will speak and nobody else would speak. From the Congress Party, let Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev speak.

MR. SPEAKER : Let us be practical.

[Translation]

DR. SATYA NARAYAN JATIYA (Ujjain) : They one let off even when they commit a murder but our petty offence becomes the talk of the town. You must give us opportunity to express oursalves.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I do not need that much help from you!

I have the names of ten more speakers on the list out of which only one is from JD. If JD surrenders that, we would still be left with nine names on the list. Even if they stick to five minutes each, that would mean a total of 45 minutes. A number of issues have been raised by various hon. Members on the floor of the House and if at least 50 per cent of them are to be replied by the Home Minister, I do not know much time he would take.

If you have to postpone the discussion under Rule 193, you will have to postpone it for tomorrow. You would not be able to take it up today. So, if you are telling me that they would take only five minutes each, you are not convincing me. If you say that we can start the discussion under Rule 193 at around 5 o'clock, you are not convincing me. I am not convinced that it could be finished by 5 o'clock.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I am sorry. The discussion under Rule 193 which has been listed for today cannot be postponed. Otherwise, that would be a bad precedent.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA : The hon. Home Minister would take only ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER : Are you speaking on his behalf? I would like to hear from him.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I am talking about the hon. Home Minister.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : How much time would the hon. Home Minister take if he has to do justice to the points raised by the hon. Members?

Mr. Jena, you cannot say that the hon. Home Minister would speak for only ten minutes. That means, you can as well say that the hon. Home Minister would not speak at all. But that is not going to satisfy the House...*(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA) : Sir, I can do that also!

MR. SPEAKER : We can continue the discussion on the UP debate tomorrow. Now, we will start the discussion under Rule 193 regarding India's foreign policy.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Mukherjee, you will take the floor tomorrow only for two minutes on U.P. debate.

(Interruptions)

16.10 hrs.

DISCUSSION UNDER RULE 193

India's Foreign Policy

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : We will now take up Discussion under Rule 193 regarding India's Foreign Policy. Shri Chandumajra is not present. Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee may start the discussion.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura) : Hon. Speaker Sir, on the whole, India's Foreign Policy is now proceeding sucessfully though there are some points on which this Government will have to remain vigilant. The Minister of External Affairs is a very efficient Minister and under his leadership, the Policy is being followed. I will illustrate some areas of it and give my reaction on them.

First of all, let us take India's consistent stand not to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. On this, there were pressures from many quarters that we should sign it but India did not bow down to the apprehension that this would isolate us from the international community and those pressures did not deflect it from its principal position. This is one of the points of our Foreign Policy on which we should go on as we are doing now.

Secondly, the recent voting in the Security Council is being talked about a lot. Some are saying that we should not have contested. It may be so. I do not know

whether our Ministry of External Affairs had expected that we would win. I do not think so. But it should not be forgotten that India has managed 40 votes including the votes of the three nuclear powers like China, Russia and France. Though the defeat is an unfortunate blow and those who are against the Government are taking advantage or mileage out of it. I think that last minute withdrawal from voting would have appeared that India's behaviour was cowardly. I think by not doing that, the Government has done a correct. Now there is a very serious development in our neighbourhood, both positive and Negative all along the line. One of the most negative development in this period is the fall of Kabul to the Taliban forces who virtually overran two-thirds of Afghanistan. This could have a potential negative bearing on the security environment in the North-West and pose a threat to Kashmir.

It is no secret that Pakistan and the USA are behind the Taliban.

It seems that, initially, there was some hesitation on the part of the Government of India and the Ministry of External Affairs to come out straihtaway againt the Taliban's behaviour in general, their obscurantism, their behaviour towards women and their behaviour regarding the human rights. There was some hesitation on the part of India in the beginning, probably, as I said, because of the earlier thing. But I must say that, later, India straightaway took a stand that it should have taken.

Our Foreign Minister clearly stated that India continues to recognise the previous Government under Rabbani's Presidentship and that it would will continue to do so. Therefore, this initial hesitation is now over. The next step, that is, joining with Iran and taking a firm stand in the Tehran Conference was very good. At that time, Shri Gujral was ill. Shri Chaturanan Mishra went in his place. I have heard from him that there was a very good deliberation. Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Uzbekistan were the notable absentees at Tehran. There are obvious reasons. But, at least, we could have negotiations on the point of Taliban with many other countries over there. It has helped us.

The other development in our north-west neighbouring country, Pakistan, is an interesting one and, at the same time, a complicated development. We have to keep it in mind. As everyone knows, the Benazir Bhutto Government in Pakistan was dismissed. That Government had always been anti-India taking all kinds of steps to help the terrorists in Kashmir. They thought that we would give them perhaps the best guarantee to have stability in Pakistan. But the facts of life have proved that it does not happen that way.

The new Government in Pakistan again is trying to outsmart Benazir Bhutto in thier anti-India stance. If they think that that will help them best, I think, that is not the situation. So, under these circumstances, our Government's stand that we want a people-to-people discussion on all questions is the most relevant stand. While taking all necessary steps to see to it that Pakistan cannot infiltrate terrorist forces into our country, we should also keep this stance of people-to-people discussion for future relationship This is what we should do in relation to Pakistan.

Sir, there have been very good developments in regard to our relations with our other neighbours. Let us first take the case of Bangladesh. Shri Gujral ji took the initiative in this regard. He led a delegation to Bangladesh. We all were there and a new good initiation was made in a friendly atmosphere. The talks that were initiated then have by now advanced to some other areas of activities also. The Chief Minister of West Bengal, Shri Jyoti Basu had gone to Bangladesh to discuss the vexed question of water sharing. It seems that we have made some advancement in this respect also. That is very important for both the countries. Once some kind of a settlement in reached on this question of water sharing, the other issues that are raised are also likely to get resolved - be that the question of transit, be that the question of more development. India has taken a very good stand in relation to extending help of Bangladesh by way of trade exchanges. Trade is very much unbalanced between these two countries. At the moment the trading capabilities of Bangladesh is nothing in comparison to India. I think, the way India has acted under the given situation would be advantageous to both the countries. That is why let us all hope that this water dispute would get resolved, if not finally, at least to a large extent. It would help us to have some mileage on that. That is a very positive development.

Sir, in regard to China I would like to submit that the visit of the President of the Chinese Republic to this country was very important. The agreement that has been signed between the two countries should not be taken to mean as just a repetition of the agreement that was signed in 1993. Such a feeling is growing among some sections in certain quarters. To describe this agreement as a mere update of the 1993 version is to understate the affirmative potential of its conceptual framework. The next of the present agreement unlike the text of the previous agreement pointedly acknowledges that it, "serves the fundamental interests of the peoples of India and China" to foster a long term good neighbourly relationship and that the maintenance of peace and tranquility along the Line of Actual Control "accords" these fundamental interests. This is really the most important thing. Both the countries would take the Line of Actual Control seriously. The soldiers are already being shifted from there. If this idea of 'fundamental interest' of the people of both the countries, India and China, has to be served, a new vista in this regard could also be opened. I hope our Government would try its level best and we shall also try to mobilise all the forces of the Third world to help us in this respect. It seems, from whatever of the Chinese Republic has said on his visit to India, that China also will not be

averse to this. The President has made it very clear in this speech. This is a very positive development about which India should feel happy.

Apart from these positive developments in these spheres, there are certain things about which our Government must be vigilant as these are the things about which we have to take a somewhat different attitude than what was hitherto being taken by the previous Governments. One is, about the draconian provisions of the GATT Treaty. There are many views about GATT and about changing the Patent Law. We are very much against it. Left Parties and some other parties are also against changing our Patent Law. We will have to be vigilant about the next meeting that is going to be held to discuss this question and also about the Singapore meeting which will discuss some other question. Without entering into the Constitutional debate as to whether the Marrakech Treaty has and can actually cost such binding obligations - that is, we must change our Patent law, etc. - most political parties, mass organisations and broad democratic public opinion in India are asserting that no agreement which goes against the interest of the people is binding. We shall not take it as binding even if we are told that it is binding. Whatever may be the Constitutional bickering about it, we have to stand firmly. I hope our present Government will take a different stand than was taken by the previous Government. This is one of the most important areas which we must be aware of.

The meeting that is going to take place in Singapore has posed another serious problem. G-7 and European Union Countries are pressing for enlarging the scope of WTO through the introduction of new issues in Singapore meeting, such as, Multilateral Agreement on Investment, (MAI) etc. The Developing countries have to oppose all such moves aimed against them. MAI seeks to allow MNCs to invest where and how they please, regardless of national interest and priorities and to treat MNCs at par with the national industries. We have to rebuke these attempts at domination. The recent Harare meeting of G-15 countries has given signals in these matters and India's Prime Minister has also taken a forthright decision. All developing countries will have to rally behind this stand. There is no need to roll back to the move by the developing countries. These are some of the most important points that are relevant in Foreign Policy matters. Incidentally, I have forgotten to say one thing. Among the positive developments that have taken place, another positive development is the ratification of Mahakali Treaty by Nepalese Parliament. The Communists helped in its way, along with the Government. We tried our best. That Treaty has paved the way in improving the relations with our neighbouring country and in resolving the outstanding problems.

We have to see the possibility of India becoming a member of the ASEAN. That has also to be noted. We have to see if that possibility is there and we have to direct our efforts towards it. The earlier Government had given secondary importance to foreign policy issues particularly in these spheres. It was characterised by a lack of initiative in such matters. Neglect of NAM and G-15, a tendency to bend before US pressures and the legacy left behind by this *inertia* has damaged India's national interest and her image. This has to be overcome and a more active policy has to be pursued in relation to our neighbouring countries in South Asia and South-East Asia, and with other developing countries. In this respect the policy directives set forth by the Common Minimum Programme have to be rigorously carried forward.

I would say at the very outset that positive developments have taken place in this regard. At the same time, I want to warn that in the economic matters which I illustrated, we have to be much more careful to see that we do not bend before the imperialist pressures. The pressure will be very much but counter pressure must be built through mass movement, through the combined efforts of all parties, and through establishing friendly relations with all countries.

Last but not least is solidarity with Cuba. Whichever ideology one may be believing in, one cannot deny that a small country like Cuba stuck to its stand against US pressure and still going strong. The United Nations has given its support to Cuba. India has always been friendly to Cuba. It is our duty to help Cuba in every possible way which we had been doing.

These are some of the outstanding questions of foreign policy which I place before the House. I hope our Minister of External Affairs will clarify the points raised by me.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome this discussion wholeheartedly. I welcome it firstly because it is taking place in this House, to the best of my recollection, after a very long gap of time. In consequence unfortunately we have not been able to discuss this very vital aspect of our national concern for many successive budgets. For that reason alone it has to be welcomed.

The other reason why I think it is a very welcome debate is because we are really in search of a foreign policy. In the absence of a foreign policy, an identifiable and intelligible foreign policy, it is my hope and expectation that this debate will generate sufficient ideas so as to enable us to identify and formulate a policy that could then govern the country's international conduct.

Sir, I have to submit for the consideration of the hon. Minister some preliminary observations which I think are central and are at the core of our concerns when it comes to determining the foreign policy of this Government.

I would have been personally much happier if my leader and the Leader of the Opposition, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee were here. But this debate has come up without a sufficient notice; he had to be away on an

engagement in Hyderabad and it is for that reason that I find myself having the honour to initiate the discussion on behalf of my party.

So far as the preliminary - only in the sense of coming first in the hierarchy - points that I make are concerned, the core observations concern more than other ministry, any other aspect of Governmental functioning this Ministry became an examination of the foreign and defence policies of the Government can and must only be against the litmus paper test, or criteria of stated objectives.

What are the objectives that this Government has or intends to achieve? What are the objectives that the Government intends to fulfil? It is only that examination which can, as objectively as possible, enable us to assess whether the stated policy is a success or a failure. I mentioned, however, the defence and foreign policies because there is an in-built inter-relation. But that inter-relationship is now great deal wider, much wider in fact. I have had an occasion, in a different context to say, while initiating the discussion on the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Defence that. It is ironical to have to observe that the Defence Budget of the country is a price that we have to pay for the foreign policy of our Government. Therefore, all this interconnectedness inter-relationship - wherein I have earlier stated that the Defence Budget is a price that we pay for the foreign policy. But the whole concept of security is a much wider concept. That covers the aspect not simply of military security; there is the aspect of economic security; there is the aspect of energy security; and there is the aspect of food security. All these aspects, all these various concerns have to be addressed through the agency of a foreign policy. Thereafter, that has to be followed through a proper conduct of our diplomacy.

The second point that I wish to share and I have to make, only as points though, because it is unfortunate that as important a discussion as foreign policy coming after such a long time, should come to this house at four o'clock in the afternoon. I well recognise that there are not enough votes in foreign policy, and because there are currently not enough votes, the attendance in the House is a clear and direct reflection of that. But notwithstanding that, the second point I wish to share with the hon. Minister is that unlike mistakes in other fields of governance, mistakes in the field of international relations and security-related issues do not affect one generation alone. It is many generation of the country that have to pay the price. If I were to examine the past 50 years of the conduct of our international relations and foreign policies, it would be very simple and in fact clear enough to see that a mistake in the realm of foreign policy has resulted in the continuance of Jammu and Kashmir as a problem it continues to trouble us. A mistake in the overall assessment of India's interest and conceptualisation of proper policy formulations has resulted in the bedevilment of Sino-Indo relations and an unsettled border till today. It is a mistake of international relations. That is obvious. It is a part of our living history today. It is a mistake of international relations. That is obvious. It is a part of our living history today. I cannot treat it as an example of excellence or success. The fact is that fifty years after Independence, India is possibly the one country which has the longest undefined and still unsettled land boundary, of all the nations that became independent almost contemporaneously with us. That is why I started by saying that in the field of foreign policy and defence, it is only the stated objectives of a Government that can be treated as a criterion for judging of the policy of a Government.

The third thing that I wish to put as my preliminary observations is that we had, after Independence and for some decades after that, a conceptual framework that sustained our foreign policy and fuelled it with the power of ideas. Our Government has to address itself to the relevance of that conceptual framework in a transformed global situation. So, that is the central challenge. Have we addressed ourselves to that? In the early years of Independence, what were the two supporting blocks of our foreign policy? Flowing out of that conceptual framework was a system of alliances—alliances that were bilateral, the alliances that were multilateral, and the alliances that had many nomenclatures. As a consequence of that system, a subsidiary benefit flowed—which was an extension of the conceptual framework—into a system of alliances into foreign economic policy. It is this which is now absent. We have not replaced the loss of that conceptual framework. We have no system of alliances. Therefore, the third component which is a foreign economic policy also bedevils us currently.

There is one other thought I would like to leave with the hon. the Foreign Minister before I proceed. It is this. We do like to use this phrase. It gives a sense of some satisfaction that there is a "broad consensus" about foreign policy. I beg to differ on the fundamentals of it. There is, perhaps, a consensus in the conduct of diplomacy on some issues. How should we address ourselves to an immediate problem that confronts us? The basic consensus that should sustain foreign policy of a country is not there. Even thereafter to continue to assert now there is a consensus in fact robs us the very strength of this word. Consensus is not conformity, consensus is arriving at a viewpoint which is the distillation of an idea, distillation arrived at, through discourse. I am afraid that that is not there.

These are some preliminary observations. I realise the limitations of time. I also realise the limitations of interest. From there, now I lead to how I judge. What is the principal challenge that we face today? I think it is a very major challenge that the country is addressing itself to. Since about autumn of 1989 when the rest of

the world had gone into transforming itself internationally and if I were to identify a landmark event, that would be the fall of the Berlin wall, the pulling down of the Berlin wall, and the collapse of the Soviet Union. These are not events that occur often. Since that great climacteric of international events, of global transformation, just about when the world was shifting a global gear as it were, India entered a phase of simultaneously taking up three challenges. We are simultaneously having to reorder our internal polity.

A great political party, once the dominant though in India, the Congress Party, is without any doubt objectively on the throes of final terminal demise. An alternative idea is yet to emerge to that. We have taken on. They have made an arrangement through which they are now governing or tempting to govern or pretending to govern. It is a 13 party arrangement supported by two principal pillars, both of them sit outside the Government. When it is convenient, they criticise it, when it is inconvenient they let it through the awkward arithmetical question of parliamentary life. So, we are simultaneously addressing ourselves to reordering our internal polity. Just in 1989 and in the election of 1991, we simultaneously took on the challenge of reordering our economy. We call it the new economic programme or economic reform or whatever it is.

The third was to reorder India's foreign policy so as to meet the challenges to today. This is a monumental task. Even under the ordinary circumstances it would test the capability of a people to the ultimate. Yet we have taken this on. We are simultaneously addressing these three challenges and if in so doing the conceptualisation of foreign policy and the conduct of our international relations takes a back seat, takes a lesser important position, I am not astonished by that. It is because if that old cliche, that after all, the foreign policy is a reflection of internal policy, holds any validity — I believe it does hold — if the internal policy be confused as it is confused, it is so self-evidently confused, then the foreign policy, the external policy cannot be so. By a straight-line logic it cannot be. It cannot be a convincing credible instrument of national service. The challenge therefore, does not lie simply on this Government alone. It lies on this House also, to the collectivity of this House between these transformed circumstances to be able to conceptualise, to find that idea should replace the concept that supported independent India's assertion and position in the early decades of Independence.

We have to find an alternative to non-alignment. I am not saying an alternative to the concept of speaking for ourselves or the concept of giving a voice to the have-nots of the world. Give it a name, give a concept, give a frame. We are failing to do it because we are failing internally to find order ourselves.

Why are we failing to do it? Principally, I think, we are failing to do this because we are failing in this challenging time to really define what our national interests are; what our national aims are, and what our national value systems are. This House is as divided as it is fractured. This Parliament is fractured as no other Parliament that I have experienced has been fractured.

It is not fractured simply arithmetically. It just had laboured and somewhat turgid debate on an issue of high contention. And if we be fractured on national aims and aspirations and value systems, we cannot have a foreign policy, about which assertions are made that there is a consensus. That is my view. The hon. Foreign Minister is perfectly free to rebut it, to give me a convincing answer. This is the principle challenge. The reordering of the three and while simultaneously to be able to conceptualise the policy for not just today, the policy that will see us at least into the first decade of the 21st century.

16.51 hrs.

(Shri Basu Deb Acharia *in the Chair*)

There are some very hurried notes that I have made. In addition to this, there are the challenges, what I call the new international agenda.

What are some of the issues which complicate our problem as a part of the international agenda? So, in this age of cliche phrases, 'globalisation', how do we assert national sovereignty, economic sovereignty; how do we reconcile between national interests and just and valid international concerns? That is the challenge to the Indian State. That is the challenge which straddles foreign political policy, foreign economic policy and foreign security policy. It is this challenge and it straddles all these. I think, *varun devta* or *indra devta* is to be greatly praised that we have had the benefit, the immense benefit of eight successive good monsoons. Heavens forbid but if that were not to be so, very serious and severe question marks will be placed on our food security. How is our foreign policy subserving that today?

It is known well enough, Sir, about the whole field of energy on which there is a report of Parliament. I had the honour to chair that Committee. The very first sentence of the report of Parliament on 'Energy 2,000' is 'Energy is security.' And if we have the kind of a position that we have today, the position and the field of power is perilous. Our energy situation is as disturbing as it has never been earlier. How is our foreign policy subserving as an instrument of securing the shortcomings of our energy security? This apart, I believe — the new challenges and the new international agenda — we have environment as a field, which is a part of the new international agenda. It is not simply Clintonion evangelical zeal about human rights that has introduced human rights as an issue on which really the foreign policy has begun to be seized of. That is the aspect of international terrorism. In the absence of a defined definition and an acceptable definition of international terrorism, we are the victims of international terrorism.

I do not have to cite Punjab or Kashmir or the importation of an ethnic conflict of Sri Lanka into peninsular India. Apart from that, what is happening in the North-East? It is also part of the same. I think the field of foreign policy is now so complex and these new items of international agenda really intrude upon us.

Thereafter, there are the aspects of new economic disputes which now form an integral part of foreign economic policy. Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee spoke of the impending Singapore Conference on new economic issues which are still under one zone on which there is not a consensus.

Regarding the aspects of trade, Singapore invited to discuss investments. We do not know where the Government stands on investments. We do not know what they will do in Singapore. Regarding the aspects of labour, there are questions about immigration. If there is to be free movement of money, what about free movement of people? And if we are talking about free movement of people, have we sufficiently examined what free movement of people means in the context of South Asia? What does it mean to India? We assert free movement, immigration as an issue and we wish to take it up counter or raise it as an issue to counter investment. Has he examined it with sufficient depth? What does it mean to us in South Asia? If we have a problem, as we have a problem, of unchecked illegal immigration into India, what do you do there? These are the complexities. We talk of services. Now, therefore, unless, in its own field of foreign policy, we were to really address ourselves to these issues - simply to say, 'yes, there is a consensus' - it will not, and it does not actually convince me.

I will take the five current issues. In those five current issues, the first I have listed is Afghanistan. I am very glad that almost two or two-and-a-half months after the Taliban running over Kabul, the Government finally woke up and gave its first authoritative statement. I examined that statement with some care. I do, of course, regret it greatly. Why have we landed ourselves into the position that we have in Afghanistan? In 1979, when the Soviet troops moved into Afghanistan, first we were again transiting between one Government and another. The Janata Government was transiting into the second regime and the late Shrimati Indira Gandhi. And in those crucial weeks, there was no Government.

We then would have restructed our entire foreign policy. I am not questioning that because that will be question that will be questioning history. Then we restructed our entire foreign policy around the Soviet Union and around the late Najibullah. Then we abandoned both. The Soviet Union did not abandon us. It collapsed.

It is a matter of great regret to me that when the late Najibullah was hung so inhumanly on a lamp-post at the heated airs of Bala-Isaar, there was no protest from this Government. It reminded me — whether others remembered or not, certainly Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari might remember — of what the late Abdul Ghafar Khan had said when we accepted it. The Frontier Gandhi said, 'you are throwing me to the waves. You have thrown us to the wolves.' Is it not a repetition of what we did in Afghanistan? The new statement of the Government says it. I am very glad that they have established contacts with General Dost, though it does not say so. I have no doubt in my mind that some contact has already been established and some assistance has been received from the Republics of Russia and Uzbekistan. I cannot treat the present position in Afghanistan as any kind of success of Indian foreign policy.

17.00 hrs.

I do believe that Afghanistan, unlike what we have in Mumbai, is a gateway to India. It is the gateway to India not because of any other reason but because the geography of this region has so ordained. Our history teaches us this. Centuries of invasions into India have come through that gateway to India and for us to forget that is to forget a Central reality about India's security interests. After all, it was disturbance. It is self-evident that the Taliban has a malevolent energy. And that malevolent energy shall overspill the territorial boundaries of its origin. And when it overspills, it does require this Government to inform us officially that simply they have read credible reports of the linkage between the Taliban and the Harkat-ul-Ansar. The Harkat-ul-Ansar has been active in Jammu and Kashmir not now but for the past so many months. Do we have to be told about the Harkat-ul-Ansar after Dargah Charar-e-Sharief? Do we have to be told about the Harkat-ul-Ansar when the rest of the world knows about these five foreigners who were taken hostages? Do we have to be told by the Harkat-ul-Ansar after so many foreigners continued to be on the land territory of India? The Government now tells us about the Harkat-ul-Ansar. They have read credible reports. But the Government would not stand up and say: "No, the Taliban and the Harkat-ul-Ansar are one".

Now, I come to the U.N. Vote. It is a complex subject. A part of the issue of the U.N. vote is, of course, an inherited problem. I do not simply hold this Government to account for it. But I certainly do question the Government's assessment. I am not in charge of conducting its day-to-day affairs. But if I were there, I would really not be staking my prestige onto a non-veto, non-permanent seat in the U.N. Security Council. For what purpose? I would like to know. I am not going into the semantics of how was this decision taken and who took it. I think that it is futile. That is a non-productive way to go about it. I would like to know from this Government, in this U.N. vote to the seat in the Security Council what is that India was seeking as of national advantage to India? It is lack of success. Let me put it that way...*(Interruptions)* I really try and understand if there is some deeper Marxist questioning in what you are questioning. But I fail. There is no parallel. I would

be very happy if the hon. Minister explains to us what national interest has got subserved. How has India benefited by not succeeding in winning this vote for a temporary non-veto seat in the U.N. Security Council? And if the assessment was that we were not really going to get all the votes, we thought that yet we must contnue to contest. What is that advantage which persuaded you to take that decision? No it does not matter if we lose. We will have 40 Members voting for us. What is that advantage?... *(Interruptions)* Sir, I realise the time constraint... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have spoken for half-an-hour.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : After all, there are other U.N. votes that have taken place.

On an absured thing like sanctions against Cuba, there was a wonderful vote. It is a matter of interest. On that absurd vote against sanctions against Cuba, three countries voted for sanctions - the United States of America, of cource, Israel, and most strangely, Uzbekistan. What commercial interest is coming about there? These are some aspects.

Let me come to the question of the recent 1996 Agreement. I think it is correct — and this is in part paraphrasing the Agreement itself — that long-term good neighbourly relations between the People's Republic of China and India would be subserved by attempting to revive the spirit of *Panchsheel*. I do not much like the choice of the word that the official text uses 'fostering'. 'Fostering' suggests that it is still there. I personally feel that the *Panchsheel* really died a premature death on the black heights of Aksaichin and it died there in 1962. But if you are attempting to revive it, well, fine, go ahead. We are with you because we believe that it is worthy. We also believe that peace and tranquillity - peace and tranquillity incidentally is a phrase that come during the first attempt to normalise relations between the People's Republic of China and India in 1979 — along the Line of actual Control will ultimately contribute to the resolution of the boundary question. Fine! Let us go down that path. But let us recognise what I believe are certain unalterable realities of the Sino-Indian question. Let us be unemotionally clear as to which affinity it is that we are talking about. Not through emotionalism. Are we talking of any ideological equations between India and the People's Republic of China? Is there a lasting ideological equation? Are we talking of some lasting economic and commercial equations between a large China — the post-1997 — and India? Are we talking of any military equation? Is the history of our relations and the background of it so encouraging that we seek that affinity? Then what is the history of our relations and what is the background? Therefore, I submit that it is the shone of emotionalism. It is in that light. And it is in the light also of the fact that People's Republic of China does not recognise our claims either on Sikkim or on Arunachal Pradesh, has not recognised the McMahon line, it does sit on over 37,500 square kilometres of Indian territory, continues to sit there, that it is in occupation of almost 5,200 sq. kilometres of ceded territory in the Karakoram. Either put all these aside or put them there as part of your consciousness and then seek a relationship which is a relationship of equals. My great worry in analysing the Sino-Indian relations is also on this account. Every time I witness our conduct, I find in it - I am sorry to have to say it but I have to say it - a timidity, a tentativeness, as if we continue to be psychologically traumatised by the 1962 incident. I find in it an approach of supplication ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Jaswant Singh, please conclude now.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Yes, Sir, I am concluding.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Jaswant Singh, please conclude.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I am concluding. Regarding good neighbourly relations, I want to leave one thought with the hon. Minister for External Affairs. I think it is a very good thing that the relations between India and Pakistan come on an even keel if we cannot resolve the political moves in the economic direction. But I do leave a thought with him that the foundation of good Indo-Pak relations cannot be nostalgia. A nostalgia for West Punjab, a nostalgia for Lahore is a very good thing to have, but I am not very sure as to whether that is the foundation for good relations between India and Pakistan. When I examine this great country and its position in the Comity of Nations, I cannot hold it against this Government. This Government is a creature of convenience of many parties. What fills me is a great sadness at this marginalisation of India. This saddens me. That too, I believe, is a challenge to our foreign policy.

17.12 hrs.

SHRI RAGHUNANDAN LAL BHATIA (Amritsar) : Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that we did not discuss the foreign policy in this House for a pretty long time. It is regretted that even at the time of passing of the Grants, there was guillotine and no discussion took place at all with regard to an important subject like the foreign policy.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I will come back in five minutes. Excuse me.

SHRI RAGHUNANDAN LAL BHATIA : Then, I will reply only when he comes back. Sir, we are glad that the present Governemt is continuing the proverbial basic policies of India. There is a continuity in our foreign policy and we are very happy that the new Government is pursuing the objects of our foreign policy. I do not agree with my friend Shri Jaswant Singh who has just gone out. He was trying to find fault with all the basic areas that he was not agreeing to, saying that it was wrong. But unfortunately, he made a long speech. He criticised all the areas of our foreign policy, but he did

not mention where we were wrong and how it can be remedied. He did not propose any remedy, he did not give any proposal. He was only criticising. So, it would have been better had he given some suggestions.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (Uluberia) : They destroyed the Babri Masjid only.

SHRI RAGHUNANDAN LAL BHATIA (Amritsar) : Leave it, Babri Masjid is a different matter...*(Interruptions)*

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT : If they have not told you please tell us...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAGHUNANDAN LAL BHATIA : This is the problem with you. You talk about irrelevant things about such are an important subject...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

This is foreign policy...*(Interruptions)* So, we would say that the new Government is carrying out this foreign policy which is based on our national consensus and we are quite satisfied.

Sir, it is a very vast subject. Shri Jaswant Singh has taken a long time and discussed various points, but I will confine myself to only three points. He has objected to our efforts to normalise relations with China also. He has given a background and long history of that, but I think in our policy to normalise relations with our neighbours, it is a very important step, a very important objective to develop our relations with China.

It was started in 1988 by Shri Rajiv Gandhi and there was a breakthrough in our relations. Three agreements were signed at that time and later during the time of Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, in the year 1993, on a visit of Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao to China a very important agreement was signed in respect of having peace and tranquillity at the border. All these agreements, I would say, were confidence-building measures between the two giants of Asia.

It was very important that both the countries should, step by step, normalise their relations. A Joint Group was formed. It has met, I think, about nine or 10 times and it is trying to find out the border problems, identifying the areas of difference and trying to solve them which will lead, ultimately, to the solution of the bordern problem. It is a long pending problem. There is no denying the fact about it. But it cannot be solved in a day. It requires some time and patience with which both the countries are trying to flollow. I am confident that this policy is absolutely a correct policy.

Sir, Shri Jaswant Singh asked as to what was the benefit that India would derive out of this. For his information, I will say that there would be three benefits.

Firstly, we are spending a huge amount of money on our Army. About two-thirds of our Army is pitted at the Himalayas at a very difficult terrain. The forces will come back. So, we will save expenditure and the difficulties which our military men face at that height of the Himalaya.

The second benefit would be that by this cooperation, the trade between India and China will increase and we would have a market of more than 100 crores of people whom we will be dealing with. So, the Indian industry and commerce would benefit out of that.

Thirdly, the most important benefit that India derive would be that the cooperation between the two great nations would change the whole geo-political situation in this region. That would be the biggest benefit that we would derive out of this. Shri Jaswant Singh has been a military man and he should know the change in the geo-political situation that the relationship between the two countries would bring about.

The second point I would like to make is about Afghanistan. The people of Afghanistan have been great friends of India and our relations are very old. Anything happening in Afghanistan does affect our security. Therefore, Afghanistan is very important for us and that is how India has been taking quite a bit of interest in Afghanistan.

I am sorry that I have some difference of the latest approach in respect of Afghanistan. But our general approach has been that we have been supporting the Afghan people, we have been supporting Shri Rabbani's Government because they were fighting against Shri Hekmatyar who was supported by Pakistan and then the Taliban which was again supported by Pakistan and also backed by some big powers. It has been the policy of Pakistan to have a control over Agghanistan, because their objective is very different. Their objective is to reach the C.I.S. States, to influence the C.I.S. States to have commerce with them and being Islamic countries they feel they should extend their influence over them. That has been the basic policy of Pakistan.

I must congratulate the Rabbani Government and the Afghan people, who fought well and as a result Pakistan could not achieve their objective. Now, Pakistan is in a very difficult situation. They supported. They supported Hakmatyar and they miserably failed; now, they have supported the Taliban and they have miserably failed. Now, the situation is the same.

Our policy with regard to Afghanistan is that we believe in an independent and sovereign Afghanistan and the problem should be solved by the Afghanistan people themselves. There should be no interference from outside, but unfortunately, in the present situation, there is a great interference by many powers in Afghanistan and that is the reason why the Afghanistan problem is not being solve.

Here, I have a small difference. I feel that the help that India should have given to Afghanistan has not been given. This is inadequate. For instance, when

Najibullah was hanged — he was a great friend of India — our reaction was rather slow; it should have been instantaneous. What is happening in Kabul? We have not reacted to the plight of the women and children there. We should have voiced our support to the women and children who are suffering in Kabul. It has all along been India's policy to support such causes. I would like the Government to certainly extend the help in this matter.

Now, there is another problem. The winter has arrived and the Passes will be closed and as a result there will be shortage of food. In the past, India has always been in the forefront in giving relief to the Afghan people. I would like to know from the Minister what are his plans to help the people of Afghanistan, who are our great friends. How can India be helpful in these difficult times and in their distress?

Thirdly, Shri Jaswant Singh referred to the United Nations. It is wrong to ask why India contested the election. It was based on a consensus of all the parties. Even the previous Government was trying during the last one year, for this seat. This was our aspiration. Perhaps, Shri Jaswant Singh has not contacted his leader, Shri Vajpayee. He also said that we must contest the elections. I think, the Minister would clarify the position, if I am wrong. The Minister has taken the opinion of many leaders including Shri Vajpayee, who said that we must contest the elections. So, it was necessary for us to contest the elections.

There is one area where I differ because we have been working on this for the last one year or maybe one-and-a-half years and we must have got information from our Missions abroad as to which country was likely to help us or which country was not going to help us. We are always updated with that information. Secondly, our hon. Minister met about 80 Foreign Ministers in the United Nations and exchanged views with them. He might have been able to understand as to who was going to help us or who was not going to help us. My point is that we should have made an assessment before the elections as to whether we would win or not. If the assessment was that we would not win, then we should have discussed with Japan about our providing help to them and in return to help us in future or to help us in some other way. I understand, the Minister can correct me, that Japan did approach us requesting us to help them this time and that they would help India the next time. If that was so, I would like to know from the Minister why this offer was rejected. I do not agree with Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee when she says that India got only 40 votes.

I say that 140 countries voted against India. I look to the other side. Why was it so? Why did we suffer such a big defeat? India has great prestige in the world. By this, I think that our prestige has suffered. My opinion is that before going in for voting, we should have made a final assessment and discussed with the various leaders of the different parties on the question "In this situation, should we go in for voting or should we withdraw?". It is not CTBT which is different. The national consensus was that we have to fight even if we are alone and we did well by taking that stand. Although we lost, our stand was appreciated all over the world that our foreign policy is based on ethics, morality and it stood by its consensus. But here I fail to understand why a ressessment was not made and why the Opposition leaders and friends were not consulted. We might have drawn some benefit from Japan. I do not know. But this is my information. The hon. Minister can correct me.

I would like to say that in future many elections will take place and India will fight in many areas and I think that there should be some manoeuvrability in our diplomacy to achieve national interests without compromising our basic policy. That is my point.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum) : Sir, we have consumed the entire day in discussing the foreign policy and we may take up this discussion tomorrow also.

In discussing the foreign policy, one should be concerned in the beginning about two points. One, since foreign policy is primarily a reflection of the economic interests of a given country, it has to be understood in the context of the international economy. If foreign policy is discussed without a comprehension or at least without a presentation of the international economic and political context, then it seems to me to be fruitless. We regret that we have not discussed our foreign policy fully. The regret is all the more because in the meantime there have been tremendous changes in the international situation. They say, referring to the USSR, that the Cold War has ended and that socialism has been wiped out. That is not so.

It is a mistake not to discuss the foreign policy fully, but we have to take this new situation into account and it cannot be only a repetition of the past policies which were formulated during the immediate post-Independence period.

Therefore, I begin with a survey of the international situation to place our foreign policy in the proper perspective.

The arguments and the assumptions are that the Cold War had ended because of the fall of the USSR. That is the primary postulate in our understanding. Is it really true? Has the Cold War really ended? Is it a fact that socialism has ended? In fact, if you read the literatures coming from China, you will come to know that once again they have started emphasising that the Cold War thing is growing once again not in terms of the USSR but in terms of the remaining socialist countries like Cuba, Vietnam and the country headed by China. We have to take note of that. Because the Cold War had ended to the extent that the USSR as an obstacle to world economic imperialism no longer

exists and because China is not yet that powerful as the USSR was, therefore, certain international policies both in politics and economics follow the international scene.

We are told about Afghanistan. I respect you very much. The position of Afghanistan when the Soviet Union was there was of one kind and the position of Afghanistan, our attitude and our ability to function in Afghanistan is different when the USSR no longer exists. We have to understand this changed context.

What is the international situation now? We know that the other part, which we used to call the world socialist system, has been fractured because of the destruction of the USSR. Incidentally, let me remind the House that one of the reasons of its destruction was its increasing defence expenditure which was foisted upon it by the United States. A similar thing is happening if Pakistan today where 33 per cent of its budget is spent on defence expenditure. Their absolute and total indebtedness to the international capital arises out of that. But that is in passing. That, perhaps, is a warning to the understanding of our strategy in our economic matters.

Following the collapse of this, the policies which are stated — it seems to me that we have also accepted it — are that there should be globalisation and liberalisation and all these are being imposed on the countries of the developing world. We forget this that all these are impositions on us. We have not arrived at competition, market globalisation or liberalisation on our own. All these are because of the historical fact that the USSR no longer exists and these are imposed by the developed countries which many people do not like to term them as countried given to imperialism. We forget exactly that in our case, the foreign policy primarily — I beg to differ slightly from Shri Jaswant singh — follows the economic policies, economic interests of the ruling cactus of that country. Today, in the world, the politics of either the United States' Government or the developed countries of the world are conditioned by the economic interests of the bosses of their country. It is not only this. I will illustrate on this. There was a cry long time back that for all under-developed countries like us, the central cry would be to fight for a new international economic and political order in the international situation. Our foreign policy should be tested in terms of those only. Have we succeeded or not will depend on the steps that we take in furthering the cause of a new international economic order which means a bonded free economy of the world. Let me put it this way. The developing countries despite the fact that USSR does not exist on a global plane, have developed faster than the developed countries. Unfortunately, this fast development takes place only in the few countries of the developing area like China, partly India, the East Asian tigers etc. But the vast majority of the developing countries are mired in poverty and also in politics to which I will come later.

Today the position is that 42 per cent of the exports of the developing countries are exported to the USA indicating an inherent strength that they possess. Forty seven per cent of the Europe's imports come from the developing countries and 48 per cent of Japan's exports reach these developing countries. The absorbing capacity as well as the delivering capacity in economic term is indicated by this fact which I want to underline as a source of strength of the under-developed world despite the fact that the USSR does not exist, despite the fact that there is a tendency in the world to establish a hegemony of international monopoly capital headed by the United States Government. When I quote the figures, I am acutely aware that even that does not indicate the size of the population or the strength of the economy of the world. Developing countries have a population size of more than 80 per cent of the world. They do not get their worth from this world. Now what do we see in this international economic scene? We see that in the very recent times, developing countries have been exploited by capitalism for the last 300 or 400 years. And in the process, the capitalist countries have amassed huge fortunes. They exploit their own labour but also give chance to that labour. That has happened because in certain empires the Sun was not setting. We know all that. Therefore, we wanted that capital to be back to us. It is not petitioning them, it is not begging. We have been expoited and that mess has accumulated in certain areas of the world. We wanted that. On the basis that accumulation, science and technology developed in those countries. We wanted technology along with capital from those countries as a matter of right. On a purely economic plan, we wanted that our products should have market access in these developed countries. But because there is no USSR, what is happening is, the official development made in the last twenty years has reached its low. So much so, despite the resolution of the United Nations that at least 0.7 per cent of their total output GDP they will be giving to the developing countries as aid, the developed countries contribute today only 0.29 per cent. And not only that, in fact, the development aid in 1995 had seen an absolute form of nine per cent as compared to the previous years. You all know that the world aids which are provided today are less than the repayment and the interest that the developing countries pay to the developed world. There is a not out flow. The old situation of imperialists exploitation is visible today in this new form. That, I think, the House has to understand and the House includes Shri Jaswant Singhji also.

Sir, let us acknowledge this fact that there is a huge pressure and we are fighting for the last five years for this. Every single country including China and India is now being forced to open its market in favour of the goods produced by the multinationals. That is the economic order. The belly has to be opened — if not by direct political rule, then by the control that they have over the international financial institutions. I will

mention some figures in this regard. It has already been mentioned. We all know about Cuba. I will come to that also.

The problem has been complicated because they are praising us for changing our Economic Policy, not only in India but everywhere and not because we want certain imports but because they have forced us to open the doors to their output. This is the situation. We know the story of China. So many times, they were pressurized to open their market in their favour. Sometimes, they succeeded in their resistance but not always. Once again let us remind ourselves that 'the Cold War has ended' meant only that the USSR does not exist today.

What should they do? Imagine the volume of indebtedness. As per calculations, the developing countries own burden of two trillion dollars, that is, two million million dollars. It should be two lakh crore of rupees. This is the burden. Instead of this being an asset to these countries, a return of all that exploitation that occurred in the course of the last centuries, it is adding to that exploitation to these underdeveloped countries.

Let us understand how they are going with this. We are all wintnesses to these kinds of statements for our countries as well as for other countries. They are insisting now, after the WTO, that these countries' exports cannot be permitted because they do not pay wages as high as in the developed countries. These obstacles have been raised. They say all kinds of arguments that it will bring out the environmental questions, then the question of the human rights, then the question of patents. All these are utilized as tricks to pulverize the economies of the underdeveloped countries. We have to understand when we make a Foreign Policy statement as to how do we go about in combating this, how a new economic order can be formulated. We can fight that and successfully do so.

Along with these offensives on the economic front they do not fail to hide their political offensives also. The USSR is not there; socialist countries remain. Nobody trading with Cuba knows that it is a political thorn in the neck of the United States. It is an example of how a non-capitalist economy can survive, even though it is a very small one. Therefore, it has to be strangled. Even the European countries had to oppose it. Surprisingly, we know that these are our points of hope. All of the Organisation of American Countries condemn the United States, a unanimity which was unimaginable in the past. We know the United Nation's vote also. But yet, let us know the points on which we are battling. They are trying to do this and the resistance is coming from the under-developed countries of the world and it is here that we have to take our positions in foreign policy.

What these countries are also peddling is that because of the so called absence of the cold war, the conflicts -- ethnic ones, political ones and territorial ones -- which lay hidden under that so called cold war came out and began to be exploited by the present monolistic hegemoney. They are fomenting clubs in the different parts of the world including Afghanistan to which you have referred. We have to realise that. Why is it that they are poking their nose there? Our foreign policy once again therefore has to take this in perspective and take the steps which are consistent with our perspective.

In the name of religion, in the name of worst of it, in the name of political democracy the hegemonies are imposing and they are dictating to African countries. They tried to dictate in China also saying that they do not have political democracy. And the test of political democracy according to their definition is, there must be multi-party democracy. Nothing needs to be consistent with the state of affairs in the domestic economy and polity. The pattern which has emerged in the United States, the pattern which has emerged in the developed countries have to be imposed without any consideration to the level of development of those countries. This is imperialism at the political level to defend interests of imperialism at the economic level. Therefore we know that almost irrevocably economic laws are functioning. Capitalism has its own laws. Through competition it arrives at this kind of a situation, extinguishing the poor, the under-developed, the developing countries. It is a new kind of change that is being imposed on us. It is against that that we have to test our foreign policy.

It is not all that gloomy. There is a revival of G-77. I have a complaint against the external affairs policy. It is not about the previous five years. I do not want to discuss that. They had surrendered whole hog. But we have to revive the spirit of G-77, the spirit of Bandung. I have just used the word revival, actually it is not revival alone.

We have to go beyond that because of the world context. The world context today is vastly different. Therefore, my complaint is this. Is our Government, this present Government, which we support taking adequate steps to change the countours of political hagemonism? Of course, we must realise that-beginning with Shri Jaswant Singh's opening remarks-internal economic strength will determine that.

Today, the United States is going to China with a bigger amount of technology and capital than to India despite the fact that China that it is a vast country, that is also has inherent economic strength acts as a deterrent to hegemonism. The tasks are too difficult for either India or China to handle them alone. Therefore, what should be done in the context of the economic policy is this. I do not know the specific details. But if the contexts are so changed, do we not think that our Embassies should take a through new look at it? We have to build our strength. For that, our Embassies should be our eyes on the world.

We know that the developing countries are resisting us. They have denied market access to us. Therefore, a new era has started in the world to a large extent. Our Embassies should be staffed with people of a different colour. It is not that the old, retired persons should be put there. It should not be a policy of 'not found useful in the country, therefore send them abroad'. We should post people with an understanding of the world situation, of the need of the hour of mobilisation of the developing countries, the need of the hour to become, to remain watchful about the doings of the advanced countries.

Here, I want to introduce an amendment to his statement. If it is 'continuity', it is wrong. There has to be continuity, but there has to be a break as well. Is that dialectics for you? There has to be both. We have to break away, with a new look. A change in the outlook of the Embassies is needed. We have to introduce that.

There has been criticisms here and elsewhere. Why is it that a Chief Minister was sent to a neighbouring country for discussing certain things? Well, in a changed context, if we can generate good relationships through a Chief Minister or a Deputy Leader of a Parliamentary party which wanted to form a Government here, it does not matter. The overriding consideration should be whether or not to do that under the present situation?

Let me repeat, when the USSR does not exist, should we not try our best to generate among the developing countries so that we can fight successfully together, in spite of the absence of that socialist country?

It is against this background, I shall request the hon. Minister of External Affairs to state whether we are moving along these lines. Afghanistan has been mentioned. Why are we not mentioning several other countries of Africa? Since he was your friend, you are criticising the assassination of Najibullah ...*(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : I think it is his maiden speech on foriegn policy.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : It is true. When I was in Rajya Sabha I spoke on this subject, but not here.

A mention was made about elections. A question was asked whether we should have contested at all. Well, why should we not? That is only a reflection as to where we stand. This is only a reflection that to that extent the underdeveloped countries and developing countries are also being controlled by money power. Do we not contest for the elections to the Lok Sabha even knowing that we may be defeated? One of those two people, Federick Angels, once discussed the role of elections in democracy. He says, 'if nothing else happens, elections reflect the state of consciousness of the people and therefore one should participate'.

So, in the international contest, it is a new situation emerging. We must know where we stand in the comity of nations. We should know how they have fractured, where they have gone below their mark, where we should put up more strength and where we should emphasise so that we can fight together.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : With this, Sir, I will conclude.

There has to be larger efforts in our orientation of foreign policy than in the past, since Independence, towards more and more South-South cooperation. It should not remain a mere talk. I entirely agree with the kind of relationship that we have with our neighbouring countries, whether it is China, Bangladesh or even Pakistan. The people of Pakistan are not our enemies. We should take such steps in relation to Pakistan also — the people of Pakistan can differentiate their interests from that of the ruling class. That should be the test of our foreign policy — utterances and practices. If we are not able to do all these things, then that is the criticism you have to make about our foreign policy. If they give an assurance to move along these lines, then I would support the foreign policy of the Government which we support.

SHRI SURESH PRABHU (Rajapur) : Thank you. This is truly my maiden speech on the foreign affairs policy. So, I will start from where my hon. friend, Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee has left.

It was very rightly said that the result of an election is a testimony to know where a particular contestant stands in relation to the electorates from whom one is seeking a mandate. So, if India was trying to find out where she stands in relation to the comity of nations, the result is very loud and clear that we have lost miserably.

If we are starting a debate on the foreign affairs policy now, because we have lost it there, then we are trying to learn right lessons from what we have really got in the United Nations.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Prabhu, you can continue tomorrow. There are a number of hon. Members to speak on this. Can we take it up tomorrow? Is this the consensus of the House?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow the 5th December, 1996 at 11 a.m.

18.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, December 5, 1996/Agrahayana 14, 1918 (Saka).